



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In view of the idioms *šadāšu emēdu* and *šadā rakābu* (= *kuršu u* or *a*), "he stood on his mountain" and "he ascended the mountain," it may not be too venturesome to suggest that *ramū šadā*, "to dwell on the mountain," is another euphemism for "to be dead."

It is evidently the purpose of the opening lines of the legend to show that fortune did not smile upon the infant Sargon. That the early days of inaugurators of new eras (Moses, Cyrus, Romulus) are fraught with peril, has always been a favorite fiction. Sargon's mother was poor. His father died soon after his marriage. The widow could not turn to his brother, for he was dead. So Sargon was brought forth in secret and exposed.

If the translation of l. 3 of the legend, offered above, is correct, then it is probable that levirate marriage was practiced among the early Babylonians. The Code of Hammurabi does not mention this institution, but the Code dates from a period more than half a millennium after Sargon of Akkad. Besides, levirate marriage is a religious institution (Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, 510 f.), and would, therefore, even if still practiced in Hammurabi's day, hardly have been the subject of legislation. Or are we to think of polyandry? As has been pointed out before (Jastrow, *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 130), Urukagina attempted to abolish this institution. See Thureau-Dangin, *Sumerische und Akkadische Königsinschriften*, 54, Col. 3, 20 f. For another interpretation of this passage see King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 184. If we knew the date of the composition of the legend we might speak with a little more assurance on these points.

Even if it should turn out that the word *enitum*, ll. 2 and 5, usually translated "poor," is a variant of *entum*, "votary" (Jeremias: *Vestalin*), the interpretation offered would not be affected, for, in spite of assertions to the contrary, it cannot be proved that the *entum* and other "sacred" women could not marry and have children. In fact a text published by Poebel, *BE*, VI, pt. 2, No. 8, seems to offer clear proof that they did marry and that they had children. However, this point does not call for further discussion here.

D. D. LUCKENBILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE INTERROGATIVE PARTICLE ׀ IN HEBREW

The Hebrew and Aramaic interrogative particle ׀ is considered by some to be a contraction of a particle *hal* identical with Arabic هل.¹ Others identify it with the Arabic interrogative هـ'ā, the difference being due to a phonetic change from ' to h or vice versa, like the cockney interchange

¹ So Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*²⁸, p. 306i.

between *h* and glottal catch, or the regular change of *h* to ' in Assyrian.¹ The particle ה certainly seems to be connected with هل, but it is hardly a contraction of the longer particle; it is more likely that *hal* consists of a particle *ha* identical with ה with an added *l*-element, possibly the same demonstrative element that occurs in the Arabic definite article *al*. The particles ה and ا, however, can scarcely be identified, as there is no regular interchange between Hebrew and Aramaic ה and Arabic ا.² We have here apparently two different Semitic interrogative particles, *ha* occurring in all three languages, 'a only in Arabic.

So far as I know, no one has yet pointed out any case of the occurrence of the interrogative particle נ in Hebrew, but such an instance we seem to have in the particle אַבֵּל "surely, indeed, but." This consists of the negative particle בֵּל (Phoen. בל, Assy. *ina bali* "without" = Eth. ንባለ: 'ēnbala, Arab. بَل "but") with the interrogative particle נ prefixed, a combination similar to the particle הֲלֵא (neg. לֹא with interr. ה prefixed) "is it not, behold, verily." That such is the case is indicated by the fact that in all its occurrences in the earlier books it is practically equivalent to הֲלֵא in meaning, viz.,

אַבֵּל אֲשֵׁמִים אֶנְהוּ	"lo, verily we are guilty" (Gen. 42:21).
אַבֵּל אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה אֲנִי	"lo, verily I am a widow" (II Sam. 14:5).
אַבֵּל בֵּן אִין לָהּ וְאִשָּׁה זָקֵן	"lo, verily she has no child and her husband is old" (II Kings, 4:14).
אַבֵּל שָׂרָה יִלְדֶּת לָךְ בֵּן	"lo, verily Sarah shall bear you a child" (Gen. 17:19).
אַבֵּל אֲדִינִנוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־שְׁלֹמֹה	"verily, on the other hand, our lord has made Solomon king" (I Kings 1:43).

In the last example אַבֵּל has rather an adversative meaning, and in all its occurrences in the later books it has regularly the secondary meaning "but," viz., in Dan. 10:7, 21; Ezr. 10:13; II Chron. 1:4; 19:3; 33:17.

¹ So Brown, Driver, Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1906, p. 209; W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Cambridge, 1890, p. 47; B. Stade, *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Gram.*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 131; J. Olshausen, *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Gram.*, Braunschweig, 1861, p. 425.

Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebr. Handwörterbuch*¹⁸, p. 172 compares ה with both ا and هل without deciding between the two.

² The few cases in which we have Hebrew or Aramaic ה equal to Arabic ا (e.g., Heb. הִנֵּה = Arab. اِنَّ "behold"; Heb. הִקְטִיל = Arab. اَقْتَل "cause to kill"), are not the result of a phonetic change, but are due to special reasons in each case; cf. my paper on "Apparent Interchange between ה and נ in Semitic" in the current volume of *JAOS*.

It is not improbable that the same interrogative particle **אֵל** is to be found in the emphasizing **אֵלֵךְ** "indeed, surely," which is perhaps a combination of **אֵל** with **כִּי** "like, as, so," the original meaning being "is it so that."¹ This passes, through the medium of the rhetorical question, to the meaning "surely, indeed," and then passes from an intensive to an exclusive meaning, viz., "only."²

Whether **אֵל** "also" is to be considered as compounded of interrogative **אֵל** + a particle **א** = Arab. **أَل**, the emphatic meaning being derived from the interrogative as in the case of **אֵלֵךְ**, while not impossible, is rendered problematical by Syriac **ܐܠ** with *ā*.

FRANK R. BLAKE

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

THE DUAL ENDING *-aim* IN THE HEBREW MULTIPLICATIVE NUMERALS

The Hebrew dual ending *-aim* is apparently used in a number of passages as a multiplicative numeral ending with the meaning of "times, -fold." The numerals which appear with this ending are:

שְׁנַיִם "two-fold" (Exod. 22:3, 6, 8).

אַרְבַּעַתַּיִם "four times as much" (II Sam. 12:6).³

שִׁבְעַתַּיִם "seven times, seven-fold" (Gen. 4:15, 24; II Sam. 21:9; Isa. 30:26; Ps. 12:7; 79:12; Prov. 6:31).

רִבְוֹתַיִם "ten-thousand-fold" (Ps. 68:18).

There is, of course, no intrinsic multiplicative idea in the dual ending, no reason why "two fours" should mean "four-fold"; the origin of this suffix is to be looked for in another direction.

Now in the case of the numerals, modifications of form due to analogy with neighboring or related numerals are especially frequent.⁴ For example **חֲמִשָּׁה**, **חֲמִשִּׁים** "five," "fifty," are changed from ***חַמְשָׁה**, ***חַמְשִּׁים** under the influence of **שִׁשָּׁה**, **שִׁשִּׁים** "six," "sixty"; **עֶשְׂרִים** "twenty" is changed from ***עֶשְׂרִים** "two tens" under the influence of the other tens **שְׁלֹשִׁים**, **אַרְבָּעִים** "thirty," "forty," etc. So it is by no means impossible that the suffix *-aim* is developed in a similar way as the result of some analogy.

¹ For the use of rhetorical questions without a negative to express a strong affirmative, cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*²⁸, p. 497, § 150e.

² Cf. Gesenius-Buhl, *Heb. Handwörterbuch*¹³, p. 37.

³ This is apparently substituted by a later redactor for **שִׁבְעַתַּיִם** (which form underlies the LXX) in order to conform this passage to Exod. 21:37, but if so, it represents nevertheless the usage of one well versed in Hebrew, probably with a native command of the language.

⁴ Cf. my article "Hebrew **חֲמִשָּׁה**, **חֲמִשִּׁים**," *JAOS*, XXVI (1905), 117-19, and literature there cited; also Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik*, Berlin, 1899, p. 56, § 166 anm.

⁵ Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. vergl. Gram. d. semitischen Sprachen*, Vol. I, p. 490e.